

April 4, 2013

Dear Rep. Odea, Rep. Cafero and Rep. Fox:

As a very concerned citizen of Connecticut, I oppose RB 1155 and I am in favor of RB 6688. The significant difference between the two is that RB 6688 has promised to provide independent research regarding this issue and RB 1155 has provided no research to support the fairness of their definition of income or the fairness of their calculation of alimony.

RB 1155 defines "gross income" as having the same meaning as provided in the child support and arrearage guidelines published pursuant to section 46b-215a. The child support guidelines only take into consideration income of approx. \$350k which is usually earned through hourly wages, base pay and bonuses.

My primary concern with this definition is that it is too narrow for the very wealthy. High income earners often earn a significant portion of their income through stock options, personal investments and other complicated compensation packages. In addition, individuals in this income bracket may receive a golden parachute and elect to retire early. I feel that the definition of income needs to be addressed and more research needs to be done to make sure that there are NO loop holes for the very wealthy and it is fair to all.

RB 1155 does not back up the alimony calculation with independent statistical research and it does not make a provision for a study to provide such research. My primary concern with the calculation is that it is too broad and does not factor in the needs of the individuals. Those in the very lowest income brackets could have the highest conflicts with a calculation of this nature.

I do want to thank the committee for their hard work in putting together RB 1155 and I do want to make the comment that it is a significant improvement over the 2012, RB 5509. However, I am not in favor of it for the reasons stated above and instead I support RB 6688.

I appreciate your services and your time on this very important matter.

Sincerely,

L. Rutkowski, CT